REMARKS

Claims 20-39 were pending at the time of the last Office Action. Applicant has amended claims 20, 21, 26-30, 32, and 33 and canceled claims 25 and 31. Thus, claims 20-24, 26-30, 32, and 33-39 are now pending.

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for his consideration during the telephone interview of December 17, 2009. During that interview, applicant's representative discussed with the Examiner applicant's technology and Wilcock. Applicant's representative explained that Figure 9 of Wilcock describes a chat "call," and not a telephone call.

The Examiner has rejected claims 26-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant has amended the claims to address the Examiner's concerns. Claims 26-32 now recite a "computer-readable storage medium" that includes a memory and a disk, but does not include a signal. Thus, a storage medium is a physical device, which is a machine or manufacture under Section 101.

The Examiner has rejected claim 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicant has amended claim 33 to address the Examiner's concern.

The Examiner has rejected the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable as outlined in the following table:

Claims	References
20-22, 26-28, and 33-35	Wilcock and Kadakia
23, 24, 29, 30, 36, and 37	Wilcock, Kadakia, and Roach
25, 31, 38, and 39	Wilcock, Kadakia, and Wengrovitz
32	Wilcock, Kadakia, and Miller

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections. Nevertheless, applicant has amended the claims as discussed during the telephone interview. The claims now make it clear that a time division multiplexing ("TDM") telephone is being controlled by a client system using a control channel that converts between session initiation protocol ("SIP") messages and computer telephony integration ("CTI") messages.

Applicant's technology is directed to techniques for client systems (e.g., personal computers) that control and monitor telephony devices (e.g., time division multiplexing phones). According to applicant's technology each telephony device has a physical representation and a logical representation. The physical representation of a telephony device represents its physical attributes such as buttons on the dialing pad and the speaker button. The logical representation of a telephony device represents the communication link (e.g., telephone line) of the telephony device. The client systems have relationships with telephony devices so that the client systems know what telephony devices they are to control and monitor. A client system controls and monitors a telephony device via the physical and logical representation of the telephony device. The client system establishes a device control channel between it and the physical representation of a telephony device that it controls and a call control channel between it and the logical representation of that telephone device. Once the channels are established, a client system can control and monitor the telephony device. For example, the client system can use the device control channel to request that the telephony device via the physical representation place a call to a certain number or can receive via the call control channel an indication of an incoming call to the telephony device.

In rejecting the claims, the Examiner relies on Wilcock at Figure 9 and paragraphs 0187 and 0188 as describing "controlling and monitoring via client system calls placed through telephony devices." (Office Action, Oct. 2, 2009, p. 4.) The Examiner believes that Figure 9 illustrates that "Fred's" customer endpoint system corresponds to a telephony device. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Fred's customer

endpoint system is clearly a computing device through which Fred conducts a chat session with "Agent Joe," who is a customer service representative. The content of the chat session is shown in the text-chat window 85 of Figure 9. Figure 9 does not illustrate any control or monitoring of a telephony device. Although the accompanying text, as the Examiner points out, does suggest that the customer service representative desktop illustrated in Figure 9 "may be used in conjunction with other channels, e.g., telephony," Wilcock provides no explanation what is meant by "used in conjunction with."

The Examiner relies on the architecture Wilcock's Figure 3 as corresponding to the "providing of a logical representation and a physical representation for the telephony device," "determining relationships between client systems and telephony devices," "establishing a device control channel between the physical representation of the telephony device," "establishing a call control channel between the logical representation of the telephony device," and so on as recited by the claims. Wilcock, however, makes it very clear that Figure 3 illustrates "elements of a web interaction by which multiple parties can communicate with each other across the web (World Wide Web)." Figure 3 does not describe any elements relating to communicating via a telephony device.

More fundamentally, each claim recites that a client system controls the telephone device. Independent claim 1 recites "under control of the user interface of each client system that has a relationship with a telephony device, controlling the telephone device." Independent claim 26 recites "under control of the user interface of the client system, controlling the first telephony device." Independent claim 33 recites "each client system for controlling and monitoring calls placed through the telephony device by performing steps comprising ... controlling the first telephony device."

Even if the customers (e.g., Fred) who communicate with the customer service representatives do have a telephone, the endpoint of the customer service

representation (which the Examiner believes corresponds to the claimed client system) does not control the customer's telephone. Moreover, the endpoint of the customer service representative certainly does not control the customer's telephones "to place a call" as recited by each independent claim. Because Wilcock's customer service representative does not place calls via the customer's telephone, the Examiner has not established that applicant's claims are unpatentable.

Based upon the above amendments and remarks, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and its early allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (206) 359-8548.

Please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account No. 50-0665, under Order No. 418268867US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: January 4, 2010   Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Maurice J. Pirio
  Registration No.: 33,273
PERKINS COIE LLP
P.O. Box 1247
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247
(206) 359-8548
(206) 359-9000 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant